

Applic. No. 10/534,681
Amdt. dated November 21, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 24, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 21 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 11-23 remain in the application.

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 18-23 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Frank et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,705,587 B1) (hereinafter "Frank") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 18 calls for, *inter alia*:

the annular width being wider than the step width for creating an enlarged contact surface for an effective force between the second component and the step.

Applic. No. 10/534,681

Amdt. dated November 21, 2007

Reply to Office action of July 24, 2007

It is noted that the corporate assignee of the Frank reference is also the assignee of the instant application. Therefore, applicants are very familiar with the Frank reference.

The Frank reference discloses a method for positioning the actuating drive in a fuel injector device for implementing said method. Frank discloses a compensation collar (9) disposed below a piezoactor (2).

On page 2 of the Office action, the Examiner alleges that Frank discloses "a coining ring 9 having an annular width and a height as recited."

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation is not accurate. Particularly, the compensation collar (9) does not have an annular width that is greater than the shoulder between a first bore and a second bore. The figure of the drawing of Frank explicitly shows that the compensation ring (9) has an annular width that is less than the shoulder between the first bore and the second bore. Accordingly, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation with respect to the "coining ring 9" of Frank, is not accurate.

Applic. No. 10/534,681
Amdt. dated November 21, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 24, 2007

As seen from the above-given remarks, the reference does not show the annular width being wider than the step width for creating an enlarged contact surface for an effective force between the second component and the step, as recited in claim 18 of the instant application.

Since claim 18 is allowable over Frank, dependent claims 19-23 are allowable over Frank as well.

In item 4 on page 2 of the Office action, claims 11-17 have been rejected as being obvious over Frank (U.S. Patent No. 6,705,587 B1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 11 calls for, *inter alia*:

inserting a coining ring into the second bore up to the step.

As noted above, the Examiner alleges that the compensation collar (9) of Frank reads on the coining ring of the present invention as claimed. Frank does not disclose that the compensation collar is placed on a shoulder between the first bore and the second bore. Accordingly, Frank does not

Applic. No. 10/534,681

Amdt. dated November 21, 2007

Reply to Office action of July 24, 2007

disclose a method compressing a coining ring to a specific dimension, as is further recited in claim 11 of the instant application.

It is a requirement for a *prima facie* case of obviousness, that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

As seen from the above-given remarks, the reference does not show or suggest inserting a coining ring into the second bore up to the step, as recited in claim 11 of the instant application.

The references applied by the Examiner do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, it is believed that the Examiner has not produced a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Since claim 11 is allowable over Frank, dependent claims 12-17 are allowable over Frank as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 11 or 18. Claims 11 and 18 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent

Applic. No. 10/534,681
Amdt. dated November 21, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 24, 2007

on claims 11 or 18, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 11-23 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

11/23/2007 VBUI11 00000021 10534681

01 FC:1251

120.00 OP


Applic. No. 10/534,681

Amdt. dated November 21, 2007

Reply to Office action of July 24, 2007

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

AKD:cgm

November 21, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101